

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 635

HE 018 734

TITLE Community Service and Higher Education.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education,
Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 85
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (090) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports
- Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT AAHE Bulletin; v37 n10 p3-13 June 1985
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; Citizenship Education;
*College Role; *College Students; Higher Education;
Public Policy; *School Community Relationship;
*Social Action; *Student Participation; Student
Projects; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Brown University RI; *Public Service; Stanford
University CA

ABSTRACT

The college's role in promoting community service activities and in developing students' sense of civic responsibility is addressed in two articles: "Community Service and Higher Education: A National Agenda," by Governor of Virginia Charles Robb and Brown University President Howard Swearer; and "Community Service and Higher Education: Obligations and Opportunities" by Frank Newman, Catherine Milton, and Susan Stroud. Governor Robb considers the decline in civic confidence and five principles for developing a youth service system, as well as congressional initiatives (e.g., links between service and student financial aid). Mr. Swearer is concerned with: how a national service program could serve national social service needs as well as provide youth training, a grassroots approach to constructing a national service scheme, and college initiatives. Topics addressed in the second article include: the college's role and program and service opportunities for developing youth civic responsibilities, and faculty attitudes toward this commitment. After an overview by Mr. Newman, Ms. Milton provides a brief history of the start of a public service initiative at Stanford University, while Ms. Stroud briefly describes the involvement of Brown University students in social service activities. Each article concludes with questions and answers. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND HIGHER EDUCATION: A National Agenda

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

by Governor Charles Robb and Howard Swearer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Governor Charles Robb

As a nation, we're in retreat. We're backing away from one of the major charges of American education: the cultivation of character and civic commitment in our young people. Almost since its beginning, education in this land has had the uncommon charge to equip every citizen not only to think independently, to contribute economically, and to be self-sufficient, but also to assume responsibility for the common good.

Our national need for commitment to civic involvement is probably greater today than ever before. National issues grow more complex daily. So, too, does our dependence on higher education for both the skills and knowledge necessary to individual success. Our evolving experience with the new conditions of international co-operation and competition tells us that the nation of tomorrow requires citizens with the will to tackle seemingly intractable problems, to accept and indeed thrive on the absence of simple solutions, to tolerate diverse values and perspectives, to change as our tools and methods change, and to be aware that many individual problems yield only to common or even global solutions.

Evidence of the Decline in Civic Confidence

I am disturbed by evidence that even as we face a rising need for citizens with the capacity and motivation to participate and assume leadership, the will and confidence to do so seem to be declining.



The Honorable Charles Robb, governor of Virginia, has long been interested in the issues of education and public service. He has served as cochairman of the Huxon Center on Education and Employment Policy, as vice chairman of Jobs for America's Graduates, and is currently chairman of the Education Commission of the States. He presented this paper at the closing plenary session of the 1985 National Conference on Higher Education.

Consider, if you will, some indications of which we all have read.

One, responding, perhaps, to a prolonged period in which we were buffeted by what seemed almost routine abuse of the public trust, the polls are showing significant declines in trust in government and a related decline in confidence that our common problems can be solved through the traditional political process.

Two, almost all sectors of society report declines in confidence in other institutions: in organized labor, the press, medicine, the military, organized religion, and even education.

Three, many Americans—and especially young people—report doubt that an individual can make a difference. Our young people seem somehow to have moved from the almost-frantic activism of the 1960s through a period of something like disengagement with public life to a condition that now approaches lethargy. These changes are reflected in the decline in the number of people voting in presidential and other elections, in increased participation in narrowly focused interest groups, and in the growing influence of such groups at all levels of the political process.

Indeed, the nationwide trend actually shows a scarcity of candidates for school boards and similar bodies and a marked decline in the number of volunteers for major public service. You know, as I do, that leadership of this kind has been from the beginning one of the predictable outcomes of collegiate study. Freshmen coming into higher education now—reflecting broader trends in society—regrettably know less about the American political system than their predecessors knew, and they show a decided shift toward self-interest, as opposed to civic responsibility.

The annual results of the American Council on Education/UCLA surveys of college freshmen¹ show a 15-year decline in expectations of participation in the political life of the country, in any form of altruism, or in concern for

ED261635

AAHE 12734

the interests of others. Over the same time, student interest in values associated with money, status, and power has risen rather rapidly and steadily.

Most of us would agree that the college years ought to be a period of personal growth, including growth in responsibility toward, and awareness of, the interests of others. Yet the evidence suggests that these influences may not be as strong as in the past.

The challenge of rekindling the commitment to civic responsibility is one that we all face—government, the private sector, education, leaders from all segments of our society.

Let me describe an approach that appeals to me and to several others who took part in a national forum recently under the sponsor-

Considering youth service in another sense, I am increasingly persuaded that a broadly framed program of national service may be one excellent way to cultivate the sense of citizenship—of responsibility to give of oneself to the larger community. It may have the effect, also, of building understanding, tolerance, maturity, and other traits essential for effective performance in business, government, or other activities later in life.

Principles for a Program

I do not intend today to advance a specific proposal, but let me outline five principles that ought to be observed in developing a system of youth service.

First, the program should mean a minimal interruption of people's

not be federal service. The federal government, the states, the localities, and the private sector all could provide alternatives for young people to meet their service obligations without incurring substantial additional expense to the public. Many programs already exist. What is missing is the scale necessary to accommodate large numbers of young people and the general commitment in public policy to service as a component of our growth and maturation.

Fourth, fulfillment of the service obligation ought to bring educational benefits, perhaps not unlike those that worked so well for the GI Bill. Several educational leaders, including David Saxon of M.I.T., have advanced this notion as a possible response to the brooding national crisis in funding for student financial aid.

Fifth, youth service should not be, at least primarily, an employment program. Rather, it should be a means of fostering commitment to civic responsibility and engagement with the mainstream of our national society and economy for all of our young people. Indeed, to make such a program a make-work or welfare effort would be a serious mistake.

Many arguments can be posed for and against youth service, whether voluntary or compulsory. Fortunately, many programs already exist and we can study their impact in concrete terms. All of us know about such federal efforts as the Peace Corps and the Job Corps. What many may not know is that some 30 states and localities now support their own form of youth service programs. These tend to be projects that benefit the community, such as resource conservation, emergency relief, care for the elderly, or work rebuilding

... I am increasingly persuaded that a broadly framed program of national service may be one excellent way to cultivate the sense of citizenship—of responsibility to give of oneself to the larger community.

ship of the Education Commission of the States Business Advisory Commission. I have felt for a long time that we give up something as a nation and take away something from young adults when we omit service to the community, state, or nation from the list of normal experiences shared by virtually all.

In fact, my own personal bias is that we made a fundamental tactical error in moving away from the concept of universal military service, a concept as old and as deeply entrenched in our body of national tradition as the first gatherings of local militias on village greens in towns like Williamsburg and Boston. But I did not come today to argue this issue *per se*.

careers, yet it should make a lifetime impact on their understanding of the concept of community.

Second, the emphasis should be on incentives—to motivate young people to serve; and the service itself should be designed in such a way as to benefit each young person who participates.

Third, youth service should involve a range of options rather than a single monolithic system. Most who have looked at this issue believe, as I do, that the primary force behind any successful program of youth service must be the federal government, if only because no other entity is comprehensive enough to administer a system. But the service itself need

The challenge of rekindling the commitment to civic responsibility is one that we all face—government, the private sector, education, leaders from all segments of our society.

roads, bridges, and inner-city neighborhoods. Young people, 18 and older, work under close supervision and on tight schedules that teach them good work habits, job-related skills, and civic values. Examples include the California Conservation Corps, the San Francisco Conservation Corps, and the City Volunteer Service in New York City.

Congressional Initiatives

There are at least three proposals before Congress this year addressing youth service and at least two of the three include overt links between service and student financial aid. Senator Gary Hart of Colorado and Congressman Robert Torricelli of New Jersey have jointly called for the creation of a national commission to determine the feasibility of a national youth service to which all young people would belong for periods of 12 to 24 months.

All of us know about such federal efforts as the Peace Corps and the Job Corps. What many may not know is that some 30 states and localities now support their own form of youth service programs.

Congressman Leon Panetta of California has called for the federal government to give grants to state and local voluntary youth service programs on a 50/50 matching basis. Under the terms of the federal grants, states may provide post-service benefits, including education grants and loans, in addition to in-service remuneration.

Senator John Glenn of Ohio has proposed having student volun-

teers contribute one-quarter of their salary to an education trust fund, which would be augmented by matching federal funds upon completion of their service.

And, of course, there are also proposals to restore the traditional GI Bill to replace the current version and to establish a new program that would provide federal student aid in return for community service on the part of young men and women.

A Natural Tie-In

Clearly, the nation's higher education institutions must have a major role in any youth service program. The College Work Study Program affords a natural tie-in with youth service. It could be made more flexible, expanded both in funding and in options to provide meaningful work opportunities for college students. As an alternative to virtually all the current proposals about guaranteed student loans, this option seems to me to make excellent sense. It can enable needy students to attend college yet at the same time curb the potentially disastrous impact of interest obligations on the large sums that some students now are required to borrow. Loans should continue to play a role in financing college attendance, but we need to be cautious about the negative consequences of an over-reliance on loans in terms of the attitudes and opportunities of our nation's youth.

I know that many of you are at work within your own institutions to address the problem of civic education. I realize you cannot do this alone. Yet there are actions college and university leaders can take in cooperation with others in positions of responsibility to foster in our young people the capacity

and motivation to reach beyond self and to play an active part in addressing the nation's problems.

In my current capacity as chairman of the Education Commission of the States, I am very much committed to working with you and with leaders from the federal government, the states, local communities, business, industry, labor, and other segments of society to ensure that our youth are equipped for responsible service to this nation.

Howard Swearer

America has undergone some major attitudinal changes in the last 20 years, some of them very negative, including the growth of group exclusivity to the detriment of community and national interest. Of course, the national ideology has always experienced the conflict between rugged individualism and cooperative endeavor. However, recent trends seem to point to a preoccupation with self to the point of selfishness and a decline in public morals. We now have a legitimate ideology that says it is perfectly alright—indeed one is encouraged—to make as much money as possible, for this contributes to the national good.

I am concerned that the various national reports on higher education stressing the need to enhance quality and rigor in the education process seem to miss the significance of this attitude and ideology. If our objective is to educate our young people to meet the demands of society, we cannot hope to succeed unless we also educate them

Congress can't even pass an appropriation to set up a study commission to investigate the feasibility of a national service scheme. This surprises me, because national service is an idea that should appeal to both the left and the right.



Howard Swearer, as president of Brown University, brought to that institution the first of the fellowship awards from the Star Foundation, designed to encourage undergraduates to perform public service. Prior to coming to Brown, Dr. Swearer served as president of Carleton College. He delivered these remarks to the closing plenary session of the 1985 National Conference on Higher Education.

in their responsibilities to society. It is my view that participation in volunteer or low-paid activities that are important to the community is one way of both enhancing education and developing a sense of civic pride and values.

I have been advocating a scheme of national service for a long time, but I was certainly not the first. Some years ago, the Potomac Institute issued a study—in which a number of college presidents participated—laying out a program for public service.² It just sank beneath the waves.

When I was a director of The

German Marshall Fund, the Fund sponsored a study of volunteer or national service in Germany and in France.³ We used that study as the organizational focus of a Washington conference, trying to stimulate interest in the concept. Representatives of Congress, the administration, the press, and others attended, and everyone thought it was a good idea . . . but absolutely nothing happened.

As Governor Robb noted, there are several bills for a national service program currently in Congress, but there have been similar bills around for at least 10 to 15 years, and they never go anywhere. Congress can't even pass an appropriation to set up a study commission to investigate the feasibility of a national service scheme. This surprises me, because national service is an idea that should appeal to both the left and the right.

National Service Meeting National Needs

Indeed, a program of national service could serve a number of national needs. There are many tasks in this society that could be performed by volunteers: helping the elderly, assisting in teaching the disadvantaged, cleaning up the environment—"good things" that we've talked a lot about, but are not doing as rapidly or as thoroughly as they should be done. In addition, such a program could address, in part, the youth unemployment problem by providing training and giving young people an educational experience that will prepare them to play a productive role in later years.

The concept of national service also could significantly alter the present system of need-based financial aid for higher education. I have grown increasingly worried

over the last three or four years about federal financial aid based strictly on family need. We have already seen an erosion of the political support for that concept. And if we're honest with ourselves, we have seen an erosion of the consensus within the academic community on the way need-based aid should be administered. It is clear that a number of families have discovered ways to manipulate need-based aid.

In the long run, if we're to have a strong financial aid program for students, it will have much more political and public support if it is based on a service rendered, either before or after college. The old GI Bill was very popular . . . not only with the GIs who benefited but with the whole society, because it was viewed as aid in return for the obvious contribution the GIs had made to the country. I am not arguing that all financial aid should be based on service, but at least a portion of it should be moved in that direction.

Despite the potential benefits, despite the years the national service concept has been around, I doubt that with the size of the federal deficit and the lack of interest by the present administration much will come of a national service program for the next several years.

University Initiatives

However, a number of colleges and universities are taking on the challenge of enhancing the civic education of their students by enlarging and emphasizing volunteer and public service programs of their own. Many of these programs have been in existence for some time, but had fallen by the wayside a bit during the '60s and '70s; now they are coming back with renewed vigor.

At Brown, we were fortunate to be able to raise an endowment of some \$2 million for fellowships that we give to students who have performed significant periods of public service for little or no pay. Our largest student organization is the Brown Community Outreach, through which hundreds of students are participating each week in a variety of useful activities in the Rhode Island community. We also have a number of internships, in summer and during

establishment of a large, stagnant federal bureaucracy. Second, it is much less expensive to fund the endeavor in a decentralized manner.

Everyone who has thought seriously about national service stresses that it cannot be simply a federal effort, that we don't need another federal make-work project. However, a program begun at the university, local, and state levels, and coordinated efficiently, could form the basis for a rational,

sion of meaning into their lives, which is, after all, what education is all about.

Q&A

Question from the audience: What about the role of business in the local and state youth service programs?

Swearer: Many businesses already are involved in programs at the secondary school level, and it would be fairly easy initially for the universities to tie into the existing secondary school programs. There is an increasing awareness in the corporate world of social responsibilities. I think business would help fund some of these programs if they saw it was a real benefit to the community.

Robb: I certainly agree. At this point, given the lack of specific interest by government—regrettably at all levels with certain notable exceptions—the role that business can play could be the crucial role right now. One of the principal reasons we created the Business Advisory Commission within ECS

Everyone who has thought seriously about national service stresses that it cannot be simply a federal effort, that we don't need another federal make-work project.

the academic year, that give students an opportunity both to learn job skills and to provide some beneficial service to society.

Certainly Brown is only one of many universities—including Harvard, Stanford, Dartmouth, and Georgetown, to name several—that is making its own effort to foster an interest in public service and citizen education.

Constructing a Grassroots Base for National Service

And this leads me to a conclusion that, at least at this time, our strategy should be to work in a decentralized way, at the university, city, and state levels, rather than waiting on the initiative of federal legislation. With, as Governor Robb mentioned, some 30 state and city programs, as well as naturally complementary programs in colleges and universities, there could be built up a grassroots base for a national service scheme.

The grassroots approach counters two of the major problems everyone identifies with a national service effort. First, it avoids the

well-run federal program.

The entity for handling the necessary coordination should be the Education Commission of the States. ECS has the opportunity to pull together information from various colleges and universities, develop a national database of internship and other work programs, and stimulate work with companies and community organizations to create internship roles. Higher education has already helped get the effort in motion, but ECS would move it along faster.

At Brown—and at other institutions—despite the data showing that students are more self-interested than they were 10 years ago, the students are ready to get involved when opportunities are there, to work hard, and to find reward in their efforts. Students can do a lot on their own, but the student body turns over every four years, and they've got to have the institutional structures within which to work. Students who participate in these programs, we have found, experience not only a sense of fulfillment but a new infu-

Students who participate in these programs, we have found, experience not only a sense of fulfillment but a new infusion of meaning into their lives, which is, after all, what education is all about.

and focused on this particular topic first was because we thought there was a natural alliance that could help cement that relationship between education and the business community on a broader scale but still provide focus for this particular effort.

Question from the audience: How can this kind of national service program accommodate the needs of the growing number of college students who are working adults, especially at the community colleges?

Swearer: Frankly, I haven't given that a lot of thought. I do think, however, that even for working adults it is very important to somehow inculcate a sense of the neces-

transitional experience from education to the world of work. In the best of all worlds, we might design a program to fit into that transition time between secondary education and postsecondary education or work. We would give the maximum exposure to the sense of civic responsibility at this early time, and then attempt to build into the system the flexibility to adjust to the needs of community college students and others.

I think it's clear that some portion of financial aid should always be based on family need. But you could edge some of it over into aid based on service, and generate stronger political support.

sity for voluntary service. As Governor Robb pointed out, we are seeing a drop-off in volunteerism, and for those of us in private universities, that is a great worry; volunteers are our lifeblood, not only in the sense of giving money but in giving time and effort. Nevertheless, I am really a little more concerned about the 18-to-25 or 26 generation, because that's where we've seen some drop-off in the sense of obligation to the society.

Robb: I think one of the reasons we ought to target the early part of the, say, 18-to-24 year old group is that these individuals are less likely to have full-time family or work responsibilities or can plan accordingly. A broad range of options is important in designing a program that accommodates the maximum number of needs. When I spoke of not interrupting careers as one of the criteria to look at, it seems that can best be accomplished if we focus on an early juncture in the

Question from the audience: On this same point, a connection between a public service requirement and student financial aid would have a major impact on older students.

Swearer: I think it's clear that some portion of financial aid should always be based on family need. But you could edge some of it over into aid based on service, and generate stronger political support.

By the way, my stress on a decentralized effort does not mean that I think we should avoid pressing for changes in federal legislation. College Work Study is a natural. It tends to be favored by Congress, and if it could be loosened up to allow institutions to be more flexible and creative with the work permitted under it, that would help considerably with volunteer programs, particularly summer programs. There also might be changes instituted in the

guaranteed student loan program, possibly some amount of loan forgiveness in return for volunteer service after college.

Notes

¹Alexander W. Astin, *The American Freshman: National Norms* (Los Angeles: American Council on Education and University of California at Los Angeles, issued annually).

²The Potomac Institute, *Youth and the Needs of the Nation: Report of the Committee for the Study of National Service* (Washington, D.C.: The Potomac Institute, 1979).

³Roger Landrum, "National Service in West Germany and France," in *National Service: Social, Economic and Military Impacts*, ed. by Michael W. Sherraden and Donald J. Eberly (Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1982), pp. 71-80.

DIRECTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Interested in submitting an article for publication in *AAHE Bulletin*? The following guidelines should help:

- Submissions for publication should be 1,500 to 2,500 words in length.
- All manuscripts must be typed, double-spaced, on 8½"x11" paper (one side only), with at least one inch margins.
- Manuscripts are usually published within 6 months of acceptance.
- The *Bulletin* is not refereed.
- Fresh, factual information is what we need, but extensive footnotes or references are not required.
- AAHE reserves the right to edit, shorten, or lengthen articles at the editors' discretion.
- Questions should be directed to Jann Teeple-Hewes, managing editor.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND HIGHER EDUCATION: Obligations and Opportunities

by Frank Newman, Catherine Milton, and Susan Stroud

- What is the role of the university in educating young people to their civic responsibilities?
- Where are the success stories—what programs and service opportunities are colleges making available?
- What is the attitude of the faculty toward this role for higher education?

Addressing these and other issues are three experts who have been working to build a coalition of service activities in higher education.

Susan Stroud: I'd like to open with a couple of assumptions as a starting point for our discussion. The first is that by providing opportunities to perform service, as educators we are encouraging in our students a lifelong commitment to social concerns and active citizenship. The second is our working definition of public service, which is a vague phrase and applies to a large range of activities. We are using public service here in its most encompassing sense to include not only volunteer social-service activities but also government service and community action with nonprofit agencies. This definition will vary from institution to institution and will be determined to a large extent, I expect, by how comfortable a school is with activities that are more or less political in nature.

At this point I would like to ask Frank Newman: Why should college students be involved in public service?

Frank Newman: One of the interesting aspects about the whole question of service is the degree to which this country has, over the years, focused particularly on the period that young people nowadays typically spend in college,

that is to say, the late teenage years. It is a recurring theme in our lives that has been evidenced by the New Deal programs such as the Civilian Conservation Corps, as well as post-war programs such as ROTC, Peace Corps, VISTA, Teacher Corps, and the Washington intern programs conducted by many colleges and universities. These demonstrate a fundamental, deep-seated American belief that somehow young people ought to be involved in public service as an integral part of the period of growth, development, and learn-

Susan Stroud is director of the College Venture Consortium, based at Brown University. Frank Newman is executive director of the Education Commission of the States and author of a forthcoming report titled Higher Education and the American Resurgence. Catherine Milton is special assistant to the president and director of the Center for Public Service at Stanford University. They conducted this discussion at the 1985 National Conference on Higher Education.

ing that comes right about the time of the college experience.

In relation to this tradition, I want to argue three points: The first is that the United States—and the rest of the world, for that matter—is confronted with a situation that demands from our young people an understanding of the greater impact of issues and a commitment to the public.

For example, we used to talk about pollution; now we call it toxic waste. We used to think it was a problem that could be taken care of in a small community. We now recognize it as a worldwide problem—no single community is able to address the complex dilemmas of acid rain, disposal of toxic materials, the introduction into the environment of new and dangerous chemicals. These issues demand of us a capacity to get together. Nuclear disarmament demands this of us. And we could go on with a growing list of concerns that call for an increased level of student sophistication and an understanding of broader responsibilities.

Yet at the very time we need this new capacity for cooperation, for pulling together across community, even international, boundaries, every measure we've found

... we tend, more than we used to, to take care of students ... we provide them with excellent services that eliminate many of the traumas of student life but also eliminate the opportunities for them to begin to learn many of the issues of adulthood.

shows a declining capacity on the part of our young people to do this. Every measure of willingness to participate in the larger social order—voting, being involved in public affairs, feeling a responsibility for others—all are diminishing. The indicators that are rising are those of self-interest—interest in prestige, interest in a good job, what a friend of mine calls the “BMW syndrome.” This ought to alarm us.

My second point is that it is at this time of young adulthood when people are most open to the concept of citizen responsibilities. It's the first time most of them are away from home. It's the first time they vote. It's the first they take on all kinds of adult responsibilities—how they are going to feed themselves, what their obligations to their roommates and colleagues are. It's a time in which their minds, as Bill Perry has shown us, are being pried open by the events of their college education, offering us an opportunity to address this issue.

One of the difficulties is that many things we do on the campus now reinforce an avoidance of

civic responsibility. For example, we tend, more than we used to, to take care of students: We used to have freshmen dorms, where younger students had to fend for themselves. Increasingly, we want to make their lives smooth, effortless, troublefree, so we put them in dorms with older students who can show them the ropes. In other words, we provide them with excellent services that eliminate many of the traumas of student life but also eliminate the opportunities for them to begin to learn many of the issues of adulthood.

Finally, I want to argue that one cannot learn civic responsibility or public leadership by taking a class. That is exactly what we did when Watergate raised the question of ethics for lawyers: We began introducing ethics courses within law schools, taught by law faculty who hadn't done anything ethical for years. Students are a lot smarter than we give them credit for being. They know there is a difference between what we say in the classroom and what we practice.

We must think about what it is that students can actually do that will give them the hands-on experience of being a leader, in the best sense of that term, and of understanding their relationships in a broader sense than just self-interest. I hope as the discussion progresses we will begin to get at the question of how on our campuses do we draw students into these responsibilities.

Stroud Catherine Milton came to Stanford two years ago and has made remarkable strides in encouraging a greater number and range of service activities at Stanford. Those have now been focused in a Center for Public Service, and I think some of the programs that have been established there will serve as useful models for other campuses. I've asked her

to talk today a little bit about the process of developing increased awareness of and support for service activities.

Catherine Milton: I'd like to give you a brief history of how the public service initiative was launched recently at Stanford, as well as touch upon ideas we got from other universities and describe some of our programs.

At Stanford, the concern and the decision to put an emphasis on public service really came from the top. Don Kennedy, Stanford's president, had become very concerned about the swing toward careerism, the concern with, as Frank has called it, the BMW syndrome. He wondered whether the students had, in fact, changed or what was really going on.

He'd had a number of students come to him complaining that they might be interested in something like the Peace Corps but there was no one at the university encouraging them in that direction; and every time they picked up a newspaper or magazine they got a different message about what young people ought to be doing, such as getting into business school or law school.

The issue was topped-off in his mind when he gave a speech to a Stanford conference on entrepreneurialism which attracted several thousand students. The founder of Apple Computer and a lot of the very successful entrepreneurs from Silicon Valley presented the message that it's great to go out there and be creative, and you can do that and make a whole lot of money. Not that that is a bad thing to do, but I think that President Kennedy felt that it was also important to give students another message—that there are other rewards for a career of dedication and creativity.

As a result, he brought me in as a consultant to evaluate the exist-



Frank Newman



Catherine Milton

ing programs at Stanford that might be encouraging public service, to generate ideas for new programs and for ways to bolster the current ones, and to investigate the major barriers to public service.

Partly out of necessity, one of the first things that I did—which turned out to be very beneficial—was to use students to conduct the evaluations of the current programs and come up with ideas for new efforts.

Our major conclusion was that there had been a great deal of activity for many years at Stanford—volunteer programs, students doing internships in Washington—but most of it was decentralized, and with no coordination and no sense that any effort was encouraging this activity. Many of the groups, particularly the volunteer student organizations, were very isolated and weren't getting much support. In fact, a lot of roadblocks were put in their way by the university. Even the dean of students said that his role often was telling students why they couldn't have this kind of fund-raiser, why they couldn't do that, rather than trying to encourage activity.

We also learned that there was a

lot of pent-up enthusiasm on the part of the students to do the kind of things that, according to the press, students are no longer interested in doing. We found, in fact, so much energy and so much willingness to try new things that it's become a joke around the office—we've been tempted to put up a sign, "No New Ideas Welcome Here," because every day we have 10 or 20 students coming in with ideas for projects or assignments.

Within a year, we managed to organize and get funding for a variety of programs. Many of these are ones for which either we stole the idea from another university or we came up with the idea independently but then discovered that someone else was doing it; so I don't claim that these are new ideas but they are the kinds of things that can be done.

- We have four new fellowship programs at Stanford. One is a very straightforward summer program for public service in which we give grants of up to \$1,200 for students who present an idea of

loan forgiveness program to help students who want to go into public service careers but can't afford to do so.

- We have been able to put a lot more emphasis on local internship programs, action research programs, and programs in Washington, D.C.

- A volunteer center, which we're just getting off the ground, will serve as a clearinghouse, work at identifying volunteer projects in the community, and attempt to encourage every student to do at least one bit of community service while at Stanford.

- A group of alums and graduate students have put together a program to advise students on how to get jobs in the public sector.

- From students came the idea of having a special focus on hunger and a number of fund-raising events. Close to a thousand students are involved. For one week this spring there will be activities in all the dorms and classes, as well as a major conference on hunger.

We also learned that there was a lot of pent-up enthusiasm on the part of students to do the kind of things that, according to the press, students are no longer interested in doing.

how they can make a difference in the community. Students, faculty, and community members will judge the proposals and will award the money. We also have a new fellowship program for students going to Washington to work on special committees of the House and Senate. And we have a post-graduate program honoring John Gardner, being done jointly with the University of California, which provides stipends for outstanding seniors who want to work for one year with a distinguished mentor in the area of public service.

- The law school has created a

- Students also have brought together a task force on national initiatives and have been reviewing legislation that might be proposed at the national level to encourage public service, as well as coming up with ideas for commissions and ways that the private sector might also get involved.

It has been very hard for us to evaluate whether our methods have been successful or not. We have done a questionnaire as a base line and within another year we'll be able to have some comparison. But I can tell you that in one year we have tripled the number of students who have signed up to

... in one year we have tripled the number of students who have signed up to join the Peace Corps . . . we also have quadrupled the number of students who have signed up to go into public school teaching programs.

join the Peace Corps, so that now Stanford is again the leader proportionally in the country. That was a position we had held in the mid-'60s and had lost. In one year we also have quadrupled the number of students who have signed up to go into public-school teaching programs. We look at these as examples of success.

The conclusion I have reached through all of this is that the students are eager to get involved. With a little effort and some resources invested in promoting public service efforts, you can generate a lot of activity, and you can generate money from individuals in the community and from corporations.

I also believe that the higher education institutions have a special leadership role in this area. I speak as someone who is new to the field of higher education; I worked for many years at the federal level and was very much involved in legislation and in efforts to bring about national change on other issues. I believe that universities and colleges have a very special position and will be listened to at the national level.

Stroud: Let me just reinforce some of Catherine's statements by my experience at Brown. Consistently for the past five years or so

there have been approximately 700 to 800 students involved, through the largest student service organization at Brown, in a whole range of social-service activities—tutoring children in the community, working with the elderly, volunteering in a great number of areas. The increased interest in public service that we've seen recently has been, I think, a direct result of the university standing up and taking a position on the educational value of service.

I think interested students are there and the enthusiasm is also there. If the students get the message that this is an important aspect of their education and if the opportunities are made available, then the response has been overwhelming on every campus that I am familiar with. Students are eager for the experience.

At Brown we are also looking at ways to connect classroom learning with service opportunities. For instance, a program to address the social and political causes of world hunger has been initiated to bring to campus some well-known speakers on that subject, but the connection was never really made between the subject matter and how students can get involved—to identify opportunities for them to go out and act on their concern. It's the old adage that experience enhances classroom learning.

I would like to encourage you to tell us about projects you're aware of on your own campuses and elsewhere. The three of us are trying to build a coalition of university and college campuses interested in promoting service opportunities with the federal government and with state and local communities. You may be aware that in the past two years 13 new state and local programs have been started around the country that involve young people in service positions in their communities. I believe Frank has found, in talking with

many state governors, that this is something that is likely to continue to grow: developing programs that allow young people to respond to national needs.

Q&A

Question from the audience: There are so many barriers to public service that relate to financial issues, but one possible solution that particularly interests me is federal forgiveness of loans in return for public service. I'm not hearing anything about it—only what has been done on an institutional basis.

Milton: The loan forgiveness program at the law school was launched with a grant from a private individual for \$350,000. The amount students pay back will be tied to how much money they earn over the years. Based on current calculations, we think this will be enough to endow the program. This was a case where they did find an individual who would not have given money to the law school for anything else but happened to believe in this.

We also have looked at the idea of a loan forgiveness program at the federal level. There is a precedent in loan *deferral* at the federal level for students who go into the Peace Corps or the military. We have been talking with other individuals about the possibility of having some loans at the federal level forgiven if students go into public service. Our feeling is that it is costly, but the barriers to many students are so severe that it is something we should at least be discussing at the national level.

Question from the audience: What were the key components of the service programs that made students want to participate, and, furthermore, what would make faculty want to participate in such programs?



Susan Stroud

Milton: Students have told me that the main thing that has turned them on has been the chance to do something they believe in and that their ideas count for something. Everyone now cares about hunger, for example, yet now students are beginning to feel there is something each can do as an individual and have an impact. I view my role at Stanford as being a facilitator, helping students try out their ideas in a responsible way.

Newman: I want to add something to that. What students often say is, "In the classroom, I'm a nothing; I sit there and get lectured at. Out on the job, I'm a something." At least a significant part of the motivation is self-focused, but for a good end. It's an Adam Smith theory, that public good is going to come from private goals. I think students need ways to express themselves and I also think that there's some altruism in it.

I want to go back to your question about the faculty. My experience in talking with different faculty groups around the country about these issues has been very discouraging. If I didn't believe that this is something that could be overcome in the long run—and I believe that primarily out of an unreasonable sense of optimism—I would be discouraged.

The public has been extremely interested in this effort. The faculty has been extremely negative. Not all faculty, of course, but the general reaction has been, "This isn't any of our business. Students aren't here to get into these frivolous things like learning citizenship and becoming able to function in American society. Students are here to learn mathematics or sociology. That's why they come to my class. The real issue is whether they learn the methods of sociology I am teaching them." When you ask about the question of other

values, they say, "None of that ideological indoctrination in my class."

And people really have said to me over and over again, "This isn't a function for higher education"—forgetting that the original function of education in this country was for the development of civic leadership.

We have a major task on our hands to convince the faculties of this country that they've got to change their ways on this issue. I think it's absolutely at the core of our problems.

Question from the audience: If the faculty has been as negative as you say, yet you indicate that the support of the institution is critical to these programs, then who is the institution? Where will the support come from? And where is the current impetus coming from?

Stroud: The question of who is the university is a tricky one. At Brown, of course, the initiative for our effort came directly from the president. With the faculty, I think it varies.

There are probably a lot of faculty at Brown, as at other institutions, who volunteer time to the community. I was talking the other day with a chemistry professor whom I had known for several years and found out for the first time that he had been spending five hours a week talking with prison inmates—not about chemistry, but just in conversation. One of the things we might try to develop at Brown is a greater sense of the level of participation and community activity that actually exists on our campus.

Newman: The faculty must be integral to this whole thing. American higher education rightly functions on a faculty-up basis. But reform in American higher education rarely comes from within. It

comes from without. We don't like to think of that, but if you look at the great reforms in our universities, they've come from outside. Therefore, there has got to be a major public debate about this and gradually the change will come about as the faculty will begin to respond.

Stroud: The precedent for that, of course, is the debate on the quality of secondary education in the past couple of years and what that has done by way of bringing in resources to address that issue. That debate has to get started.

Newman: Another aspect of this national debate will be the question of mandatory service. It will be necessary for that to be part of the debate, but my own reaction, after a lot of thought, is that mandatory service is the wrong answer.

There are great advantages to mandatory service. One of them is that the people who need the service opportunities the most—the ones who need to learn their responsibilities as a citizen and the passive students who just sit in class anonymously doing whatever is expected—are the ones who will never show up to volunteer for the kind of programs that Catherine and Susan are talking about. National service picks up those people. And it has, of course, the advantage of equity—everybody is involved in it. I think it also has a level of political coercion and complexity for which the country shouldn't wish to sit still.

We ought to be prepared for that aspect of the debate but that shouldn't become the focus. We've got to make the center of the debate the fact that this country must have a renewal of its capacity for generating a sense of public involvement, and the institutions of higher education have an integral role in that. ■